

Semistar operations on Dedekind domains

Jesse Elliott

California State University, Channel Islands

One University Drive

Camarillo, CA 93012 USA

jesse.elliott@csuci.edu

October 11, 2011

Abstract

We give an explicit description of the lattice $\text{Semistar}(D)$ of all semistar operations on any Dedekind domain D from its set $\text{Max}(D)$ of maximal ideals. This description is constructive if $\text{Max}(D)$ is finite. As a corollary we show that $2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \leq |\text{Semistar}(D)| \leq 2^{2^n}$ if $n = |\text{Max}(D)|$ is finite; we compute $|\text{Semistar}(D)|$ if $|\text{Max}(D)| \leq 7$; and we show that if $\text{Max}(D)$ is infinite then $\text{Semistar}(D)$ has cardinality $2^{2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}}$.

Keywords: semistar operation, Dedekind domain, principal ideal domain, closure operator, Moore family, multiplicative lattice

MSC: 13F05, 13F10, 13A15, 13G05, 06A15, 06F05

1 Introduction

Let D be an integral domain with quotient field K . A *semistar operation* on D is a closure operation $\star$ on the lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$ of all nonzero D -submodules of K such that $I^\star J^\star \subseteq (IJ)^\star$ for all $I, J \in \mathcal{K}(D)$ [11] [3, Theorem 1.4]. Semistar operations were introduced in [11] as a generalization of *star operations*, which were introduced by Krull in [6, Section 6.43] in the guise of his *'-operations*.

An often-studied problem in the existing literature on semistar operations is to compute the cardinality of $\text{Semistar}(D)$. It is clear that D is a field if and only if $|\text{Semistar}(D)| = 1$, and it is well-known that D is a discrete rank one valuation domain (DVR) if and only if $|\text{Semistar}(D)| = 2$ [11, Theorem 48]. One also has the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let D be an integrally closed domain.*

1. *Semistar(D) is finite if and only if D is a finite dimensional Prüfer domain such that the set $\text{Max}(D)$ of its maximal ideals is finite [7, (5.2)].*

2. Suppose that D is local and of finite dimension n . Then $|\text{Semistar}(D)| \geq n+1$, with equality holding if and only if D is a discrete valuation domain (of rank n); and D is a valuation domain if and only if $|\text{Semistar}(D)| \leq 2n+1$ [8, Theorems 3 and 4].

Note that the set $\text{Semistar}(D)$ of all semistar operations on D is not just a set: it is naturally partially ordered by the relation $\leq$, where $\star_1 \leq \star_2$ if $I^{\star_1} \subseteq I^{\star_2}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$. The partially ordered set (poset) $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is a complete lattice, and one has

$$I^{\wedge \Gamma} = \bigcap \{I^\star : \star \in \Gamma\},$$

$$I^{\vee \Gamma} = \bigcap \{J \in \mathcal{K}(D) : J \supseteq I \text{ and } \forall \star \in \Gamma (J^\star = J)\},$$

for all $\Gamma \subseteq \text{Semistar}(D)$ and all $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$ [3, Proposition 13.6]. In Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 we give an explicit description of the lattice $\text{Semistar}(D)$ of all semistar operations on any Dedekind domain D in terms of the set $\text{Max}(D)$ of its maximal ideals.

For $\text{Max}(D)$ finite our description of the lattice $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is constructive and yields the following theorem. Let $J \in \mathcal{K}(D)$. For all $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$ we let $I^{v(J)} = (J :_K (J :_K I))$. The operation $v(J)$ on $\mathcal{K}(D)$ is a semistar operation on D called *divisorial closure on D with respect to J* [12, Example 1.8(a)]. Note that $v(D)$ is the *divisorial closure* semistar operation $v : I \mapsto (I^{-1})^{-1}$ on D . Also, for any set X we let 2^X denote the power set of X , partially ordered by inclusion.

Theorem 1.2. *Let D be a PID such that $\text{Max}(D)$ is finite.*

1. *The lattice $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is isomorphic to the lattice $\mathcal{C}(2^{\text{Max}(D)})$ of all closure operations on the complete lattice $2^{\text{Max}(D)}$. Explicitly, the map*

$$\mathcal{C}(2^{\text{Max}(D)}) \longrightarrow \text{Semistar}(D)$$

acting by

$$* \mapsto \bigwedge \left\{ v(I) : I \in \mathcal{K}(D) \text{ and } \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D) : ID_{\mathfrak{p}} = K\} \in (2^{\text{Max}(D)})^* \right\}$$

is a poset isomorphism; alternatively, one has $* \mapsto \star$, where $\star$ is the largest semistar operation on D such that $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$ is $\star$ -closed if $\{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D) : ID_{\mathfrak{p}} = K\}$ is $\star$ -closed in $2^{\text{Max}(D)}$.

2. *The lattice $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is anti-isomorphic to the subposet*

$$\text{Moore}(2^{\text{Max}(D)}) = \left\{ \mathcal{Y} \subseteq 2^{\text{Max}(D)} : \mathcal{Y} \text{ is closed under arbitrary intersections} \right\}$$

of $2^{2^{\text{Max}(D)}}$. Explicitly, the map

$$\text{Semistar}(D) \longrightarrow \text{Moore}(2^{\text{Max}(D)})$$

Table 1: Number of semistar operations on a Dedekind domain D

$ \text{Max}(D) $	$ \text{Semistar}(D) $
1	2
2	7
3	61
4	2 480
5	1 385 552
6	75 973 751 474
7	14 087 648 235 707 352 472

acting by

$$\star \mapsto \{\{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D) : I^\star D_{\mathfrak{p}} = K\} : I \in \mathcal{K}(D)\}$$

is a poset anti-isomorphism with inverse acting by

$$\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \bigwedge \{v(I) : I \in \mathcal{K}(D) \text{ and } \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D) : ID_{\mathfrak{p}} = K\} \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

In Section 4 we obtain the following as a corollary of these constructions.

Theorem 1.3. *Let D and D' be Dedekind domains.*

1. *The lattices $\text{Semistar}(D)$ and $\text{Semistar}(D')$ are isomorphic if $\text{Max}(D)$ and $\text{Max}(D')$ have the same cardinality.*
2. *If $\text{Max}(D)$ is infinite, then $|\text{Semistar}(D)|$ is equal to $2^{2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}}$.*
3. *If $|\text{Max}(D)| = n$ is finite, then $2^{\binom{n}{\leq 2}} \leq |\text{Semistar}(D)| \leq 2^{2^n}$, and $|\text{Semistar}(D)|$ is given for $n \leq 7$ as in Table 1.*
4. *If $|\text{Max}(D)| = 2$, then $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is isomorphic to $2^{\{1,2,3\}} - \{\{1\}\}$.*
5. *If $|\text{Max}(D)| = 3$, then $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is anti-isomorphic to the lattice with Hasse diagram given as in [4, Figure 1].*

In the spirit of Theorem 1.1 we make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.4. *Let D be an integrally closed domain such that $\text{Max}(D)$ is finite. Then D is a principal ideal domain (PID) if and only if $|\text{Semistar}(D)|$ is equal to the number of subsets of $2^{\text{Max}(D)}$ that are closed under arbitrary intersections.*

2 Background on semistar operations and nuclei

A *magma* is a set M equipped with a binary operation on M (which we write multiplicatively). An *ordered magma* is a magma M equipped with a partial ordering $\leq$ such that $x \leq y$ and $x' \leq y'$ imply $xx' \leq yy'$ for all $x, y, x', y' \in M$. An

ordered magma M is said to be a *multiplicative lattice* (resp., *near multiplicative lattice*) if M is a commutative monoid and one has $\bigvee(XY) = (\bigvee X)(\bigvee Y)$ for all subsets (resp., nonempty subsets) X, Y of M [3]. A multiplicative lattice is equivalently a near multiplicative lattice M such that $\bigwedge M$ exists and annihilates every element of M . For the purposes of this paper the relevant examples are as follows.

Example 2.1. Let D be an integral domain with quotient field K .

1. The complete lattice $\text{Mod}_D(K)$ of all D -submodules of K is a multiplicative lattice under the operation $(I, J) \mapsto IJ$.
2. The lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$ of all nonzero D -submodules of K is a near multiplicative lattice.

For any self-map $\star$ of a set X we write $x^\star = \star(x)$ for all $x \in X$. A *closure operation* on a poset S is a self-map $\star$ of S satisfying the following conditions for all $x, y \in S$.

1. $x \leq x^\star$.
2. $x \leq y$ implies $x^\star \leq y^\star$.
3. $(x^\star)^\star = x^\star$.

A *nucleus* on an ordered magma M is a closure operation $\star$ on M such that $x^\star y^\star \leq (xy)^\star$ for all $x, y \in M$. Nuclei were first studied in the contexts of ideal lattices and locales and later in the context of quantales as *quantic nuclei* [10].

Theorem 2.2 ([3, Theorem 1.4]). *A semistar operation on an integral domain D is equivalently a nucleus on the near multiplicative lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$. Moreover, the following are equivalent for any self-map $\star$ of $\mathcal{K}(D)$.*

1. $\star$ is a semistar operation on D .
2. $\star$ is a closure operation on the lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$ and $(aI)^\star = aI^\star$ for all $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$ and all nonzero $a \in D$.
3. $\star$ is a closure operation on the lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$ and $(I^\star J^\star)^\star = (IJ)^\star$ for all $I, J \in \mathcal{K}(D)$.
4. $IJ \subseteq K^\star$ if and only if $IJ^\star \subseteq K^\star$ for all $I, J, K \in \mathcal{K}(D)$.

If $\star_1$ and $\star_2$ are nuclei on an ordered magma M , then we write $\star_1 \leq \star_2$ if $x^{\star_1} \leq x^{\star_2}$ for all $x \in M$. This defines a partial ordering on the set $\mathbf{N}(M)$ of all nuclei on M . If $\bigvee X$ exists in M for all nonempty subsets X of M (which holds if M is a near multiplicative lattice), then by [3, Proposition 4.3] the poset $\mathbf{N}(M)$ is a complete lattice and one has

$$x^{\bigwedge \Gamma} = \bigwedge \{x^\star : \star \in \Gamma\},$$

$$x^{\bigvee \Gamma} = \bigwedge \{y \in M : y \geq x \text{ and } \forall \star \in \Gamma (y^\star = y)\},$$

for all $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbf{N}(M)$ and all $x \in M$.

Corollary 2.3. *For any integral domain D one has $\text{Semistar}(D) = \mathbf{N}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ as partially ordered sets.*

If M is an ordered magma, then the map $\mathbf{N}(M) \longrightarrow 2^M$ acting by $\star \longmapsto M^\star$ is an anti-embedding of $\mathbf{N}(M)$ in 2^M . We will denote the image $\{M^\star : \star \in \mathbf{N}(M)\}$ of this anti-embedding by $\mathbf{M}(M)$. In particular, the poset $\mathbf{N}(M)$ is anti-isomorphic to the poset $\mathbf{M}(M)$. [3, Proposition 4.6] implies the following.

Proposition 2.4. *Let D be an integral domain with quotient field K . The poset $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ consists of all sets of the form $\mathcal{C} - \{(0)\}$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is any subset of $\mathcal{K}(D)$ satisfying the following three conditions: (1) $(0) \in \mathcal{C}$; (2) if $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ then $\bigcap \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{C}$; and (3) if $I \in \mathcal{C}$ then $(I :_K J) \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $J \in \mathcal{K}(D)$. Moreover, the complete lattice $\text{Semistar}(D) = \mathbf{N}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ of all semistar operations on D is anti-isomorphic to the poset $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{K}(D))$.*

3 Constructing the lattice of all semistar operations

In this section we construct the lattice $\text{Semistar}(D) = \mathbf{N}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ of all semistar operations on any Dedekind domain D from the set $\text{Max}(D)$ of its maximal ideals.

If D is a Dedekind domain, then for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)$ we let $v_{\mathfrak{p}} : K \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ denote the normalized $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic valuation on K . We let $\mathbb{Z}[\infty]$ denote the near multiplicative lattice $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$, where $a \leq \infty$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a + \infty = \infty = \infty + a$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}[\infty]$. Also, we let $\mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]$ denote the multiplicative lattice obtained from $\mathbb{Z}[\infty]$ by adjoining an annihilator $-\infty = \inf \mathbb{Z}[\infty]$. In particular, we assume $-\infty + \infty = -\infty = \infty + (-\infty)$. Also, for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]$ we define $-x$ and $|x|$ in $\mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]$ in the obvious way.

For any near multiplicative lattice M and any set S the set M^S of all functions from S to M is a near multiplicative lattice under pointwise multiplication. For any set S we let

$$\mathcal{Z}(S) = \{f : S \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\infty] : f^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}_{<0}) \text{ is finite}\},$$

which is a sub near multiplicative lattice of the multiplicative lattice $\mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]^S$.

In the next proposition we show that $\mathcal{K}(D) \cong \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$ as near multiplicative lattices. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)$. Define $\mathfrak{p}^\infty D_{\mathfrak{p}} = (0)$ and $\mathfrak{p}^{-\infty} D_{\mathfrak{p}} = K$. For any $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$ we define $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I) \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ so that $ID_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I)} D_{\mathfrak{p}}$. For any function $f : \text{Max}(D) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]$ we let

$$[f] = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)} \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})} D_{\mathfrak{p}} = \{x \in K : v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \geq -f(\mathfrak{p}) \text{ for all } \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)\}.$$

There is a map $[-] : \mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]^{\text{Max}(D)} \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_D(K)$ acting by $f \longmapsto [f]$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let D be a Dedekind domain, and let $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]^{\text{Max}(D)}$.*

1. $f \in \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$ if and only if $[f] \neq (0)$.
2. If $f \in \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$, then $[f]D_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})}D_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)$.
3. If $f, g \in \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$, then $([f] :_K [g]) = [-(-f + g)]$.
4. The map $[-] : \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}(D)$ is an isomorphism of near multiplicative lattices with inverse acting by $I \longmapsto (\mathfrak{p} \longmapsto -v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I))$.

Proof. Statement (1) is clear. We prove statement (2). Clearly one has $[f]D_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})}D_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We wish to show the reverse containment. Let $x \in \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})}D_{\mathfrak{p}}$. By the weak approximation theorem for Dedekind domains, there exists $y \in K$ such that

$$v_{\mathfrak{q}}(y) = \begin{cases} v_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) & \text{if } \mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p} \\ -f(\mathfrak{q}) & \text{if } \mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p} \text{ and } f(\mathfrak{q}) < 0 \\ \geq 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus $x D_{\mathfrak{p}} = y D_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $y \in [f]$, whence $x \in [f]D_{\mathfrak{p}}$. This proves (2). To prove statement (3), note that

$$\begin{aligned} ([f] :_K [g]) &= \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(\mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})}D_{\mathfrak{p}} :_K [g] \right) \\ &= \bigcap_{f(\mathfrak{p}) < \infty} \left(\mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})}(D_{\mathfrak{p}} :_K [g]D_{\mathfrak{p}}) \right) \\ &= \bigcap_{f(\mathfrak{p}) < \infty} \left(\mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})}(D_{\mathfrak{p}} :_K \mathfrak{p}^{-g(\mathfrak{p})}D_{\mathfrak{p}}) \right) \\ &= \bigcap_{f(\mathfrak{p}) < \infty} \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})+g(\mathfrak{p})}D_{\mathfrak{p}} \\ &= [-(-f + g)]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, statement (4) follows readily from statement (3) and the fact that $I = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)} \mathfrak{p}^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I)}D_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(IJ) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I) + v_{\mathfrak{p}}(J)$ for all $I, J \in \mathcal{K}(D)$. $\square$

For any set S and any $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]^S$, we write $f \preceq g$ if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for almost all $x \in S$ and $f(x) = \infty$ if and only if $g(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in S$. The relation $\preceq$ is a preorder on $\mathbb{Z}[\pm\infty]^S$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let S be a set and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(S)$. Consider the following conditions on $\mathcal{X}$.*

1. If $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\inf \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$, then $\inf \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{X}$.
2. If $f \in \mathcal{X}$ and $g \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ with $g \preceq f$, then $g \in \mathcal{X}$.
3. If $f \in \mathcal{X}$ and $g, -(-f + g) \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ then $-(-f + g) \in \mathcal{X}$.

One has $(1) \wedge (2) \Leftrightarrow (1) \wedge (3)$ and $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$. Moreover, if $S = \text{Max}(D)$, where D is a Dedekind domain, and if $[\mathcal{X}]$ for any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$ denotes the image of $\mathcal{X}$ under the isomorphism $[-] : \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}(D)$, then the above conditions hold if and only if $[\mathcal{X}] = \mathcal{K}(D)^{\star}$ for some semistar operation $\star$ on D .

Proof. First, suppose that condition (2) holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{X}$ and $g \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ with $h = -(-f + g) \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$. Note that $h(x) = \infty$ if $f(x) = \infty$, and if $f(x) < \infty$ then $g(x) < \infty$ and $h(x) = f(x) - g(x) < \infty$. In particular, $h(x) > f(x)$ implies $g(x) < 0$, which holds for only finitely many x . It follows, then, that $h \preceq f$, whence $h = -(-f + g) \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$. This shows that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3).

Next, suppose (1) $\wedge$ (3) holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{X}$ and $g \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ with $g \preceq f$. Let $x \in S$ with $g(x) < \infty$ (so $f(x) < \infty$). Define $h_x \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ as follows:

$$h_x(y) = \begin{cases} f(y) - g(y) & \text{if } y = x \text{ or if } y \neq x \text{ and } g(y) > f(y) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$-(-f + h_x)(y) = \begin{cases} g(y) & \text{if } y = x \text{ or if } y \neq x \text{ and } g(y) > f(y) \\ f(y) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By condition (3) we have $-(-f + h_x) \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, by condition (1), we have $g = \inf_{g(x) < \infty} -(-f + h_x) \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus (1) $\wedge$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2), and since (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) we have (1) $\wedge$ (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1) $\wedge$ (3).

Finally, if $S = \text{Max}(D)$, where D is a Dedekind domain, then, by Propositions 2.4 and 3.1, one has $[\mathcal{X}] = \mathcal{K}(D)^*$ for some semistar operation $\star$ on D if and only if conditions (1) and (3) hold. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Let S be a set. For any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(S)$, let*

$$\mathcal{X}^\preceq = \{g \in \mathcal{Z}(S) : g \preceq f \text{ for some } f \in \mathcal{X}\},$$

and let

$$\mathcal{X}^{\inf} = \{\inf \mathcal{Y} : \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \text{ and } \inf \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{Z}(S)\}.$$

1. $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^\preceq$ and $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^{\inf}$ are closure operations on $2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)}$.
2. For any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(S)$ one has $(\mathcal{X}^\preceq)^{\inf} \supseteq (\mathcal{X}^{\inf})^\preceq$.
3. $\mathcal{X}^\dagger = (\mathcal{X}^\preceq)^{\inf}$ is the smallest subset $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{Z}(S)$ containing $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{W}^\preceq \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{\inf} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$.
4. $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^\dagger$ is a closure operation on $2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)}$.

Proof. Statement (1) is clear. To prove (2), let $g \in (\mathcal{X}^{\inf})^\preceq$. Then $g \preceq \inf_\lambda f_\lambda$, where $f_\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$ for all λ in some indexing set and $\inf_\lambda f_\lambda \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$. Now, for almost all $x \in S$ one has $g(x) \leq f_\lambda(x)$ for all λ , and also $g(x) = \infty$ if and only if $f_\lambda(x) = \infty$ for all λ . Let

$$g_\lambda(x) = \begin{cases} g(x) & \text{if } f_\lambda(x) < \infty \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $g \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ we have $g_\lambda \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ for all λ . Moreover, one has $g_\lambda \preceq f_\lambda$, and therefore $g_\lambda \in \mathcal{X}^\preceq$, for all λ . Finally, since $g = \inf_\lambda g_\lambda$, we have $g \in (\mathcal{X}^\preceq)^{\inf}$. This proves (2). Finally, statements (3) and (4) follow readily from statement (2) and [3, Proposition 4.8]. $\square$

Combining Proposition 3.1 with Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 we obtain the following.

Theorem 3.4. *Let D be a Dedekind domain. For any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$, let*

$$\mathcal{X}^{\preceq} = \{g \in \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D)) : g \preceq f \text{ for some } f \in \mathcal{X}\},$$

and let

$$\mathcal{X}^{\inf} = \{\inf \mathcal{Y} : \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \text{ and } \inf \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))\}.$$

Let $[\mathcal{X}]$ denote the image of $\mathcal{X}$ under the isomorphism $[-] : \mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D)) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(D)$ of Proposition 3.1.

1. $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger} = (\mathcal{X}^{\preceq})^{\inf}$ is the smallest subset of $\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$ containing $\mathcal{X}$ such that $[\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}] = \mathcal{K}(D)^{\star}$ for some semistar operation $\star$ on D .
2. The self-map of $\dagger$ of $2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))}$ acting by $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^{\dagger}$ is a closure operation on $2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))}$.
3. $\mathcal{X} \in (2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))})^{\dagger}$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}^{\preceq} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\inf} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.
4. The map $(2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))})^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ acting by $\mathcal{X} \mapsto [\mathcal{X}]$ is an isomorphism of posets; explicitly, this isomorphism acts by

$$\mathcal{X} \mapsto \left\{ \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)} \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})} D_{\mathfrak{p}} : f \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$$

with inverse acting by

$$\mathcal{C} \mapsto \{\mathfrak{p} \mapsto -v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I) : I \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

By [3, Proposition 13.8] the inverse of the poset anti-isomorphism $\text{Semistar}(D) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ acting by $\star \mapsto \mathcal{K}(D)^{\star}$ acts by $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \bigwedge \{v(J) : J \in \mathcal{C}\}$. Thus we have the following.

Corollary 3.5. *For any Dedekind domain D , the poset $\text{Semistar}(D)$ of all semistar operations on D is anti-isomorphic to the subposet*

$$\begin{aligned} (2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))})^{\dagger} &= \left\{ (\mathcal{X}^{\preceq})^{\inf} : \mathcal{X} \in 2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathcal{X} \in 2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))} : \mathcal{X}^{\preceq} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \text{ and } \mathcal{X}^{\inf} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

of $2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))}$. Explicitly, there is a poset anti-isomorphism

$$\text{Semistar}(D) \rightarrow (2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))})^{\dagger}$$

acting by

$$\star \mapsto \{\mathfrak{p} \mapsto -v_{\mathfrak{p}}(I) : I \in \mathcal{K}(D)^{\star}\}$$

with inverse acting by

$$\mathcal{X} \mapsto \bigwedge \left\{ v \left(\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Max}(D)} \mathfrak{p}^{-f(\mathfrak{p})} D_{\mathfrak{p}} \right) : f \in \mathcal{X} \right\}.$$

4 Consequences of the construction

The results in this section yield Theorem 1.2 and 1.3 of the introduction.

Let X be a poset. The set $\mathbf{C}(X)$ of closure operations on X is partially ordered by the obvious relation. The map $\mathbf{C}(X) \rightarrow 2^X$ acting by $\star \mapsto X^\star$ is an anti-embedding of $\mathbf{C}(X)$ in 2^X . We will denote the image $\{X^\star : \star \in \mathbf{C}(X)\}$ of this anti-embedding by $\text{Moore}(X)$. In particular, the poset $\mathbf{C}(X)$ is anti-isomorphic to the poset $\text{Moore}(X)$.

Let S be a set. By [3, Corollary 4.7(1)], one has

$$\text{Moore}(2^S) = \{\mathcal{Y} \subseteq 2^S : \mathcal{Y} \text{ is closed under arbitrary intersections}\}.$$

($\text{Moore}(2^S)$ is the set of all *Moore families on S* [2].) For any $X \subseteq S$, define $\iota_X \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ as follows:

$$\iota_X(x) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } x \in X \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\{\iota_X\}^\dagger = \{f \in \mathcal{Z}(S) : f(x) = \infty \text{ iff } x \in X, \text{ and } f(x) = 0 \text{ for almost all } x \in S - X\}.$$

We let $\iota(X) = \{\iota_X\}^\dagger$, and for any $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq 2^S$ we let

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(\mathcal{Y}) &= \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{Y}} \iota(X) \\ &= \{f \in \mathcal{Z}(S) : f^{-1}(\infty) \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ and } f(x) = 0 \text{ for almost all } x \in S - f^{-1}(\infty)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let S be a set.*

1. *The map $\iota : 2^{2^S} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)}$ is an embedding of posets and has an order-preserving left inverse acting by $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \{f^{-1}(\infty) : f \in \mathcal{X}\}$.*
2. *The map $\iota : \text{Moore}(2^S) \rightarrow (2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)})^\dagger$ is an embedding of posets and has an order-preserving left inverse acting by $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \{f^{-1}(\infty) : f \in \mathcal{X}\}$.*
3. *If S is finite, then the map $\iota : \text{Moore}(2^S) \rightarrow (2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)})^\dagger$ is a poset isomorphism, and one has $\iota(\mathcal{Y}) = \{f \in \mathcal{Z}(S) : f^{-1}(\infty) \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ for all $\mathcal{Y} \in \text{Moore}(2^S)$.*

Proof. Statement (1) is clear. To prove (2), first note that if $f \in \iota(X)$ and $g \preceq f$, where $X \subseteq S$ and $g \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$, then $g \in \iota(X)$; and if $f_\lambda \in \iota(X_\lambda)$ for all λ in some indexing set, where each $X_\lambda \subseteq S$ and $\inf_\lambda f_\lambda \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$, then $\inf_\lambda f_\lambda \in \iota(\bigcap_\lambda X_\lambda)$. This shows that ι maps $\text{Moore}(2^S)$ into $(2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)})^\dagger$. Next, if $\mathcal{X} \in (2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)})^\dagger$ and $f \in \mathcal{X}$, then $\iota_{f^{-1}(\infty)} \preceq f$, whence $\iota_{f^{-1}(\infty)} \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, if $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, then $\inf_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} \iota_{f^{-1}(\infty)} = \iota_Y \in \mathcal{X}$, where $Y = \bigcap_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} f^{-1}(\infty)$, so $\bigcap_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} f^{-1}(\infty) \in \{f^{-1}(\infty) : f \in \mathcal{X}\}$. This shows that the left inverse of ι maps $(2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)})^\dagger$ into $\text{Moore}(2^S)$ and therefore completes the proof of statement (2). Finally, suppose that S is finite. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{Z}(S)$ one has $f \in \iota(f^{-1}(\infty))$. Therefore, if $\mathcal{X} \in (2^{\mathcal{Z}(S)})^\dagger$, then $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{X}} \iota(f^{-1}(\infty)) = \iota(\{f^{-1}(\infty) : f \in \mathcal{X}\})$, which proves that the two maps in statement (2) are inverses of each other in this case. $\square$

Combining Lemma 4.1 above with Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5, we obtain Theorem 1.2 of the introduction. We also have the following.

Corollary 4.2. *Let D be a Dedekind domain. If $\text{Max}(D)$ is infinite, then the set $\text{Semistar}(D)$ of all semistar operations on D has cardinality $2^{2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}}$.*

Proof. Note first that $\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))$ has cardinality $\aleph_0^{|\text{Max}(D)|} = 2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.5, the set $\text{Semistar}(D)$ has cardinality at most $2^{2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}}$. On the other hand, by Theorem 3.4(4) and Lemma 4.1(2), the set $\text{Semistar}(D)$ has cardinality at least $|\text{Moore}(2^{\text{Max}(D)})|$. Now, $\text{Moore}(2^S)$ for any set S is isomorphic to the poset

$$\mathcal{U}(2^S) = \{\mathcal{Y} \subseteq 2^S : \mathcal{Y} \text{ is closed under arbitrary unions}\}.$$

Moreover, the poset $\mathcal{U}(2^S)$ contains the set of all ultrafilters on the set S , which for any infinite set S is known to have cardinality $2^{2^{|S|}}$. Therefore $|\text{Semistar}(D)| \geq |\text{Moore}(2^{\text{Max}(D)})| = |\mathcal{U}(2^{\text{Max}(D)})| \geq 2^{2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}}$, whence equalities hold. $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *The set of all semistar operations on $\mathbb{Z}$ has cardinality $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$.*

Given also [2, Table 1] and [4, Figure 1], we obtain the following.

Corollary 4.4. *Let D be a PID such that $\text{Max}(D)$ is finite.*

1. *Semistar(D) is finite and has cardinality given as in Table 1 for small values of $|\text{Max}(D)|$.*
2. *If $|\text{Max}(D)| = 2$, then $\text{Semistar}(D) \cong 2^{\{1,2,3\}} - \{\{1\}\}$.*
3. *If $|\text{Max}(D)| = 3$, then $\text{Semistar}(D)$ is anti-isomorphic to the lattice with Hasse diagram given as in [4, Figure 1].*

It is known that, if X_n is a set of cardinality n for every positive integer n , then

$$|\text{Moore}(2^{X_n})| = 2^{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} f(n)},$$

where $f(n) \geq 1$ for all n and $f(n) = 1 + O(n^{-1/4} \log_2 n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and therefore $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) = 1$ [1, Theorem 1]. Thus we have the following.

Corollary 4.5. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with quotient field K , and let $K \supsetneq D_1 \supsetneq D_2 \supsetneq D_3 \supsetneq \cdots$ be an infinite descending chain of overrings of D such that $m_n = |\text{Max}(D_n)| < \infty$ for all n . Then we have the following.*

1. *There is a unique strictly ascending sequence $X_1 \subsetneq X_2 \subsetneq X_3 \subsetneq \cdots$ of subsets of $\text{Max}(D)$ such that $D_n = U_n^{-1}D$, where $U_n = D - \bigcup X_n$.*
2. *One has $m_n = |X_n|$ for all n , and therefore m_n is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers.*

3. If $s_n = |\text{Semistar}(D_n)|$ for all n , then $s_n = 2^{\binom{m_n}{\lfloor m_n/2 \rfloor} f(n)}$, where $f(n) \geq 1$ for all n and $f(n) = 1 + O(m_n^{-1/4} \log_2 m_n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore $\log_2 s_n \sim \binom{m_n}{\lfloor m_n/2 \rfloor}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Note next that the poset $(2^{\mathcal{Z}(\text{Max}(D))})^\dagger \cong \text{Semistar}(D)$ is constructed solely from the set $\text{Max}(D)$. Therefore, if $\text{Max}(D)$ and $\text{Max}(D')$ have the same cardinality for two Dedekind domains D and D' , then the lattices $\text{Semistar}(D)$ and $\text{Semistar}(D')$ are isomorphic. Regarding the converse, at least we can say this. Consider the following statement.

(P) $|2^X| = |2^Y|$ implies $|X| = |Y|$ for all sets X and Y .

It is well-known that $\text{ZFC} \not\models \text{P}$ (if ZFC is consistent) and $\text{ZFC} + \text{GCH} \vdash \text{P}$, where ZFC is Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the Axiom of Choice, and GCH is the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis (which in ZFC is equivalent to the statement that $Y \subseteq 2^X$ implies $|Y| \leq |X|$ or $|Y| = |2^X|$ for all sets X and Y). We have the following.

Corollary 4.6. *Consider the following conditions on Dedekind domains D and D' .*

1. $\text{Max}(D)$ and $\text{Max}(D')$ have the same cardinality.
2. The near multiplicative lattices $\mathcal{K}(D)$ and $\mathcal{K}(D')$ are isomorphic.
3. The lattices $\text{Semistar}(D)$ and $\text{Semistar}(D')$ are isomorphic.
4. $\text{Semistar}(D)$ and $\text{Semistar}(D')$ have the same cardinality.

One has $(1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4)$, and the four conditions are equivalent if either $\text{Max}(D)$ or $\text{Max}(D')$ is finite or if one assumes along with the axioms of ZFC the following statement: (P) $|2^X| = |2^Y|$ implies $|X| = |Y|$ for all sets X and Y . Moreover, the implication $(4) \Rightarrow (1)$ is equivalent in ZFC to the statement (P) and therefore can neither be proved nor disproved from ZFC if ZFC is consistent.

Proof. By Proposition 3.1(4) and [3, Corollary 13.2] we have $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4)$. Moreover, the elements of $\text{Max}(D)$ can be recovered from the near multiplicative lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$ as the elements lying immediately below the identity element D of $\mathcal{K}(D)$. Thus we have $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$. Suppose, then, that condition (4) holds. If either $\text{Max}(D)$ or $\text{Max}(D')$ is finite, then from Corollary 1.2 it follows that $\text{Max}(D)$ and $\text{Max}(D')$ have the same (finite) cardinality. Alternatively, if $\text{Max}(D)$ and $\text{Max}(D')$ are infinite and one assumes the statement (P), then since $2^{|\text{Max}(D)|} = 2^{|\text{Max}(D')|}$ by Corollary 4.2, one has $|\text{Max}(D)| = |\text{Max}(D')|$. Finally, since one can prove in ZFC that there is a PID D with $|\text{Max}(D)|$ equal to any given infinite cardinal $\aleph_a$ (namely, $D = k[T]$, where k is an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{X})$, where $|\mathbf{X}| = \aleph_a$), it follows that the implication $(4) \Rightarrow (1)$ is equivalent in ZFC to the statement (P) and therefore can neither be proved nor disproved from ZFC if ZFC is consistent. $\square$

Problem 4.7. In Corollary 4.6 does (3) imply (2)? Does (4) imply (3)?

5 The lattice of finite type semistar operations

A semistar operation $\star$ on a domain D is said to be of *finite type* if $I^\star = \bigcup \{J^\star : J \subseteq I \text{ is finitely generated}\}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$. By [3, Proposition 13.6] the set $\text{Semistar}_f(D)$ of all finite type star operations on D is a sublattice of $\text{Semistar}(D)$ that is closed under arbitrary suprema and finite infima; in particular it is a complete lattice. In this section we construct the lattice $\text{Semistar}_f(D)$ for any Dedekind domain D . As one might suspect this is a much smaller lattice than $\text{Semistar}(D)$ and is much easier to construct.

A closure operation $\star$ on a poset S is said to be *finitary* if $(\bigvee \Delta)^\star = \bigvee (\Delta^\star)$ for all directed subsets Δ of S for which $\bigvee \Delta$ exists. A semistar operation on a domain D is of finite type if and only if it is finitary as a closure operation on the lattice $\mathcal{K}(D)$.

Let M be a near multiplicative lattice. By [3, Proposition 5.3] the subset $\mathbf{N}_f(M)$ of $\mathbf{N}(M)$ consisting of all finitary nuclei on M is closed under arbitrary suprema and in particular is a complete lattice. Let

$$\mathbf{R}(M) = \{x \in M : x^2 = x \text{ and } x \geq 1\}.$$

Then $\mathbf{R}(M)$ is also a near multiplicative lattice by [3, Proposition 9.1]. For any $a \in M$ we let $d_a : M \rightarrow M$ be given by $x^{d_a} = ax$ for all $x \in M$. Then d_a is a finitary nucleus on M , and by [3, Proposition 10.4] the map $d_- : \mathbf{R}(M) \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_f(M)$ is a supremum-preserving poset embedding.

Example 5.1. If D is an integral domain, then $\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{K}(D))$ is the lattice $\mathcal{O}(D)$ of all overrings of D and $\mathbf{N}_f(\mathcal{K}(D))$ is the lattice $\text{Semistar}_f(D)$ of all finite type semistar operations on D . One has $I^{d_A} = AI$ for any overring A of D and any $I \in \mathcal{K}(D)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let D be a Dedekind domain.*

1. *The map $\rho : 2^{\text{Max}(D)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(D)$ acting by $\rho : X \mapsto \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X} D_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an anti-isomorphism of posets.*
2. *The map $d_- : \mathcal{O}(D) = \mathbf{R}(\mathcal{K}(D)) \rightarrow \text{Semistar}_f(D) = \mathbf{N}_f(\mathcal{K}(D))$ is an isomorphism of posets.*
3. *The map $2^{\text{Max}(D)} \rightarrow \text{Semistar}_f(D)$ acting by $X \mapsto d_{\rho(X)}$ is an anti-isomorphism of posets.*

Proof. By [5, Proposition 3.14], if A is an overring of a Dedekind domain D , then there exists a unique subset X of $\text{Max}(D)$ such that $A = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X} D_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Statement (1) follows. Statement (2), then, follow from [3, Example 10.8], and statement (3) follows from statements (1) and (2). $\square$

Corollary 5.3. *One has $|\text{Semistar}_f(D)| = 2^{|\text{Max}(D)|}$ for any Dedekind domain D .*

References

- [1] V. B. Alekseev, On the number of families of subsets closed with respect to intersections, *Diskretnaya Matematika* 1 (2) (1989) 129–136 (in Russian).
- [2] P. Colomb, A. Irlande, O. Raynaud, Counting of Moore families for $n = 7$, in: *Formal Concept Analysis*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 5986, Springer Science+Business Media, Berlin, 2010, pp. 72–87.
- [3] J. Elliott, Prequantales and applications to semistar operations and module systems, arxiv.org/abs/1101.2462.
- [4] A. Higuchi, Lattice of closure operators, *Discrete Math.* 179 (1998) 267–272.
- [5] W. Heinzer, M. Roitman, Well-centered overrings of an integral domain, *J. Alg.* 272 (2004) 435–455.
- [6] W. Krull, *Idealtheorie*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1935.
- [7] R. Matsuda, *Commutative Semigroup Rings*, Second Edition, Kaisei, Tokyo, 2006.
- [8] R. Matsuda, Note on valuation rings and semistar-operations, *Comm. Algebra* 28 (5) (2000) 2515–2519.
- [9] A. Mimouni, Semistar-operations of finite character on integral domains, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* 200 (2005) 37–50.
- [10] S. B. Niefield, K. I. Rosenthal, Constructing locales from quantales, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 104 (2) (1988) 215–234.
- [11] A. Okabe, R. Matsuda, Semistar-operations on integral domains, *Math. J. Toyama Univ.* 17 (1994) 1–21.
- [12] G. Picozza, Star operations on overrings and semistar operations, *Comm. Algebra* 33 (2005) 2051–2073.